

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed July 17, 2007, Claims 1-14 and 17-27, directed to MHC class II peptides, stand pending and rejected. Claims 1, 6, 13, 14, 22 and 27 have been amended. Support for amended claims 1, 6, 13, 14, 22 and 27 can be found generally throughout the specification and specifically within paragraphs 29 and 34-43, and 106. No new matter has been added by virtue of these amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 6, 22, and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the term “diluted” in “diluted acid”. Applicants respectfully traverse and overcome this rejection.

Applicants have amended claims 6, 22 and 27 to include the specific diluted parameters cited in these references (paragraph 41 of the specification) and examples (See, e.g. paragraph 106 of the specification referencing 0.1% diluted acid). Applicants have also amended claim 13 to reference 0.1% diluted acid. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 112, first paragraph rejection has thus now been obviated and therefore should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 1-14 and 17-27 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement for the claim phrase “about 16 to about 320 femtomols”. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 13, 14 and 27 to replace “about 16 to about 320 femtomols” with “about 16 to 320 femtomols”. Support for this amendment and this claim phrase may be found generally throughout the specification, and specifically within paragraph 29 of the specification, with a specific detailed range of about 16 to 320 femtomoles further defined. Claims 1, 13, 14 and 27, as currently amended, reflect

this femtomolar range. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 112, first paragraph rejection has thus now been obviated and therefore should be withdrawn

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-14 and 17-27 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the phrase “sequestering the complexes with immunoprecipitation, wherein antigenic peptides are coupled to beads.” Applicant respectfully traverses and overcomes this rejection.

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 13 and 14 to reflect that the complexes (not the antigenic peptides) are bound to the beads. As noted in Applicants previous response mailed April 3, 2007, this permits the steps of washing the complexes and then to elute the peptides from the complexes without the detour and additional step of eluting the complexes. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that the indefiniteness rejection has been obviated and that Claims 1, 13 and 14, as well as claims depending thereon, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the 112, second paragraph rejection be hereby withdrawn.

With regard to Claim 27, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is not subject to the indefiniteness rejection, as the objected to claim language is not contained in independent Claim 27. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the 112, second paragraph rejection be hereby withdrawn and that Claim 27 likewise be places into condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/676,909
Filed: Oct. 1, 2003

No further fee is required in connection the filing of this Amendment. If any additional fees are deemed necessary, authorization is given to charge the amount of any such fee to Deposit Account No. 08-2525.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Robert P. Hoag
(Reg. No. 39712)
340 Kingsland Street
Nutley, NJ 07110
Telephone (973) 235-4453
Telefax: (973) 235-2363

327116